whatever way makes sense to them and be prepared to explain their approach to others in the class. The lesson then concludes with a whole-class discussion and summary of various student-generated approaches to solving the problem. During this "discuss and summarize" phase, a variety of approaches to the problem are displayed for the whole class to view and discuss.

Why are these end-of-class discussions so difficult to orchestrate? Research tells us that students learn when they are encouraged to become the authors of their own ideas and when they are held accountable for reasoning about and understanding key ideas (Engle and Conant 2002). In practice, doing both of these simultaneously is very difficult. By their nature, high-level tasks do not lead all students to solve the problem in the same way. Rather, teachers can and should expect to see varied (both correct and incorrect) approaches to solving the task during the discussion phase of the lesson. In theory, this is a good thing because students are "authoring" (or constructing) their own ways of solving the problem.

The challenge rests in the fact that teachers must also align the many disparate approaches that students generate in response to high-level tasks with the learning goal of the lesson. It is the teachers' responsibility to move students collectively toward, and hold them accountable for, the development of a set of ideas and processes that are central to the discipline—those that are widely accepted as worthwhile and important in mathematics as well as necessary for students' future learning of mathematics in school. If the teacher fails to do this, the balance tips too far toward student authority, and classroom discussions become unmoored from accepted disciplinary understandings.

The key is to maintain the right balance. Too much focus on accountability can undermine students' authority and sense making and, unwittingly, encourage increased reliance on teacher direction. Students quickly get the message—often from subtle cues—that "knowing mathematics" means using only those strategies that have been validated by the teacher or textbook; correspondingly, they learn not to use or trust their own reasoning. Too much focus on student authorship, on the other hand, leads to classroom discussions that are free-for-alls.

Successful or Superficial? Discussion in David Crane's Classroom

In short, the teacher's role in discussions is critical. Without expert guidance, discussions in mathematics classrooms can easily devolve into the teacher taking over the lesson and providing a "lecture," on the one hand, or, on the other, the students presenting an unconnected series of show-and-tell demonstrations, all of which are treated equally and together illuminate little about the mathematical ideas that are the goal of the lesson. Consider, for example, the following vignette (from Stein and colleagues [2008]), featuring a fourth-grade teacher, David Crane.

ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT 0.1

As you read the Case of David Crane, identify instances of student authorship of ideas and approaches, as well as instances of holding students accountable to the discipline.

Leaves and Caterpillars: The Case of David Crane

Students in Mr. Crane's fourth-grade class were solving the following problem: "A fourth-grade class needs 5 leaves each day to feed its 2 caterpillars. How many leaves would the students need each day for 12 caterpillars?" Mr. Crane told his students that they could solve the problem any way they wanted, but he emphasized that they needed to be able to explain how they got their answer and why it worked.

As students worked in pairs to solve the problem, Mr. Crane walked around the room, making sure that students were on task and making progress on the problem. He was pleased to see that students were using many different approaches to the problem—making tables, drawing pictures, and, in some cases, writing explanations.

He noticed that two pairs of students had gotten wrong answers (see fig. 0.1). Mr. Crane wasn't too concerned about the incorrect responses, however, since he felt that once several correct solution strategies were presented, these students would see what they did wrong and have new strategies for solving similar problems in the future.



Fig. 0.1. Solutions produced by Darnell and Marcus (left) and Missy and Kate (right)

When most students were finished, Mr. Crane called the class together to discuss the problem. He began the discussion by asking for volunteers to share their solutions and strategies, being careful to avoid calling on the students with incorrect solutions. Over the course of the next 15 minutes, first Kyra, then Jason, Jamal, Melissa, Martin, and Janine volunteered to present the solutions to the task that they and their partners had created (see fig. 0.2). During each presentation, Mr. Crane made sure to ask each presenter questions that helped the student to clarify and justify the work. He concluded the class by telling students that the problem could be solved in many different ways and now, when they solved a problem like this, they could pick the way they liked best because all the ways gave the same answer.



Fig. 0.2. Solutions shared by students in Mr. Crane's class